



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,135	06/08/2006	Dan Hashimshony	31380	8998
67801 7590 12/14/2009 MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC. P.O. BOX 16446 ARLINGTON, VA 22215				
EXAMINER				
DANEGA, RENEE A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3736				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,135

Applicant(s)

HASHIMSHONY ET AL.

Examiner

Renee Danega

Art Unit

3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11, 14-16, 18-19, 23-27, 29-35, 38-40, 42-43, and 47-48, 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins (US 5568534) in view of Nagle (US 6225107).

- Regarding claims 1 and 24, Watkins teaches a device and method for tissue handling comprising providing a device comprising a structure configured for receiving and holding a tissue specimen wherein the specimen can include tissue positional references; and at least one holder (14) for holding the first outline frame (22) with the tissue specimen thus fixing the orientation of the tissue specimen in a manner allowing a clear approach for manipulation of the specimen (26); and device positional references (38) for fixing the orientation of the tissue specimen when held by the device (Figures 1, 3). Watkins doesn't expressly teach the specimen having tissue positional references. However, Nagle teaches a device for tissue handling in which points of interest are marked in the

tissue (Figure 2) and these positional references are aligned with the container (Figure 1) in order to keep track of the tissue point of interest (36) during handling (abstract) (Figure 1-2). It would have been obvious in view of Nagle to provide specimen markers and align them with the container markers in Watkins in order to keep track of particular points of interest in the sample during handling.

- Regarding claims 2 and 26, Watkins teaches the device configured to define tissue lateral and superior sides and a top face (22, 12, top at 26) (Figure 1).
- Regarding claim 3 and 27, Watkins teaches the device substantially transparent to at least one imaging modality selected from the group consisting of x-ray imaging, gamma imaging, and MRI (column 2, lines 5-10).
- Regarding claim 4 and 28, Watkins teaches a device capable of receiving tissue prior to its complete removal due to its open configuration (Figure 2).
- Regarding claim 5 and 21, Watkins teaches the device positional references are positional references built into the structure of the device (38) (Figure 3).
- Regarding claims 6 and 30, Watkins doesn't expressly teach device positional reference to be based on color code. However, Nagle teaches the device positional references to include a color code of using different

colored ink (column 3, lines 10-17) (column 5, lines 35-40). It would have been obvious in view of Nagle to use color coding in Watkins in order to provide orientation inspection from quick visual inspection.

- Regarding claims 7 and 31, Watkins doesn't expressly teach device positional references to be sutures. However, Nagle teaches the device positional references based on sutures of different lengths in order to code for sides such as the superior and lateral extremes of the specimen (column 4, lines 5-27). It would have been obvious in view of Nagle to incorporate sutures of different lengths in the device of Watkins in order to identify the orientation of the specimen within the device.
- Regarding claims 8-11, 14, 32-35, and 38, Watkins teaches the device to be appropriately rigid, flexible, stretch or expansible, and the top to be a resilient cage structure (22) (abstract) (column 3, lines 17-20) (Figure 4).
- Regarding claims 15 and 39, Watkins teaches the device formed as a box outline comprising a box outline body, lid, (22) and at least one holder (14) (Figure 2).
- Regarding claims 16 and 40, Watkins teaches the structure comprising first (22) and second (14) frames designed to be superimposed and receive and hold the tissue (12) there between and at least one holder (34) for holding first and second frames together thus fixing the orientation of the specimen (Figures 1, 2).

- Regarding claims 18, 42, 47, and 50, Watkins teaches the device further including a lining (18) (20) (Figure 5).
- Regarding claims 19, 43, 48, and 51, Watkins teaches the device further including a grid (18) (20) (Figure 5).
- Regarding claim 23, Watkins teaches the device provided in a plurality of sizes (column 3 lines 27-42).
- Regarding claim 25, Watkins teaches maintaining the specimen immobile in the device (column 4, lines 39-45).

3. Claims 12, 13, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins modified by Nagle as applied to claims 1 and 24 above, and further in view of Heaven et al. (US 5524633) .

- Regarding claims 12 and 36, Watkins modified by Nagle doesn't teach the device being a sac-like mesh. However, Heaven teaches a device for tissue handling with a stretchable body and sac-like mesh layer for excising tissue from within the body (abstract). It would have been obvious in view of Heaven to provide stretchable or sac-like mesh in the device of Watkins modified by Nagle in order to manipulate it in the body for tissue collection in vivo and not have to transfer it to a new storage device for viewing.
- Regarding claims 13 and 37, Watkins modified by Nagle doesn't teach the device to be a stretchable stocking. However, Heaven teaches a device for tissue handling with a stretchable body and stocking configuration for

in vivo tissue handling (Figure 12) (abstract). It would have been obvious in view of Heaven to provide a stocking configuration in Watkins modified by Nagle for in vivo manipulation of tissue.

4. Claims 17, 41, 46, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins modified by Nagle as applied to claims 15, 16, 24, and 40 above, and further in view of Douglas (US 3743084).

- Regarding claims 17, 41, 46, and 49, Watkins modified by Nagle teaches the holder to be a hook but not a surgical latex band. However, Douglas teaches a package held together with a spring or a rubber band to be an obvious substitution (column 1, lines 64-68). Furthermore banding items together is a common coupling mechanism. It would have been obvious in view of Douglas to provide a holder to be a latex band in Watkins modified by Nagle's device.

5. Claims 20, 21, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins modified by Nagle as applied to claims 1 and 24 above.

- Regarding claims 20, 21, 44, and 45 Nagle teaches applying a force (column 4 lines 37-49) but doesn't specifically teach the force to be less than 500 grams and between 20 and 200 grams. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a force of 20-200 grams to conform the tissue to the reference device and not unnecessarily distort it, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art,

discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins modified by Nagle as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Garrigus (US 4837795).

- Regarding claim 22, Watkins modified by Nagle doesn't teach handles on the device. However, Garrigus teaches a tissue handling device with handles (31) (Figure 1). It would have been obvious in view of Garrigus to provide handles on the device of Watkins modified by Nagle in order more easily move and grab the device.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 9/1/09, with respect to the rejection(s) of the claim(s) under Nagle have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Watkins. Watkins provides the outline device without box walls inside the frame. Additionally the open spacing of the cage permits clear manipulation as is shown with the knife in the figures and cited above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Renee Danega whose telephone number is (571)270-

3639. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30-5:00 eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571) 272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RAD

/Max Hindenburg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736